

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, Claims 1-5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention. Claim 1, 3, and 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Moshaiov et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,256,634 B1). Claims 2 and 4 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Moshaiov* in view of *Matusevich et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,119,016).

Regarding the rejection of independent Claims 1 and 3 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, the Examiner states that the meaning of “real time” is unclear. Here, in examining independent Claims 1 and 3, the Examiner is interpreting the phrase “real time” to mean “periodic time intervals.” After reviewing the application, Applicant believes that the Examiner has properly characterized the present application, as recited by the claims, which are drawn to a system and method for sharing flexible data between one master and at least two slaves in real time. Accordingly, in light of the above, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of Claims 1 and 3 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, be withdrawn.

Regarding the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) the Examiner states that *Moshaiov* teaches each and every limitation of Claim 1. After reviewing *Moshaiov*, Applicant respectfully believes that the Examiner is incorrect.

In rejecting independent Claim 1, among other things, the Examiner cites Column 1, Lines 65-67 of *Moshaiov* as teaching a wireless network comprising a master (i.e., base station) a plurality of slaves (i.e., wireless mobile terminals) belonging to the master, and a shared channel connecting the master with the slave, as recited by Claim 1 of the present application. Nevertheless, after reviewing the cited passage of *Moshaiov*, it is respectfully submitted that no mention of a wireless network having a master/slave configuration with a connecting shared channel therebetween is made, as recited by Claim 1 of the present application. Rather, the cited passage in *Moshaiov* teaches a method and system for purging tombstones for deleted items in a replicated database in which data items owned by one server are replicated by other servers. In other words, the Examiner incorrectly equates the slave servers, as taught in *Moshaiov*, with the plurality of slaves (i.e., wireless mobile terminals), as recited in Claim 1 of the present application.

Accordingly, since *Moshaiov* does not teach each and every limitation of Claim 1, it respectfully submitted that the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) should be withdrawn.

Moreover, in regards to the rejection of independent Claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b), Claim 3 includes similar recitations as those contained in independent Claim 1. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 3 is allowable for at least the same reasons as set forth above with respect to the rejection of Claim 1.

Independent Claims 1 and 3 are believed to be in condition for allowance.

Without conceding the patentability per se of dependent Claims 2, 4, and 5, these are likewise believed to be allowable by virtue of their dependence on their respective amended independent claims. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of dependent Claims 2, 4, and 5 is also respectfully requested.

Accordingly, all of the claims pending in the Application, namely, Claims 1-5, are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicant's attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul J. Farrell
Reg. No. 33,494
Attorney for Applicant

THE FARRELL LAW FIRM, P.C.

333 Earle Ovington Blvd.
Uniondale, New York 11553
Tel: (516) 228-3565
Fax: (516) 228-8475

PJF/CEA/fl